

THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS 285

the self-regard of the head of family is not so sensitive as that of the unmarried man. The man whose quick anger before marriage was approved as showing the spirit of the pallikari, is condemned as irrationally violent (ζουρλός) if, after his marriage, he draws a knife at the least imagined provocation. The underlying self-restraint of the head of the family, and the fact that the more volatile unmarried shepherds are isolated each with his own flock for the greater part of the year, contribute to a relative degree of peace and order in Sarakatsan communal life. [571]

The family head must be able to cut a figure at a wedding or a village festival. At a feast he ought to be able to drink continuously without becoming either stupefied or aggressive. To fall asleep even after long hours of dancing, feasting, and drinking, is a mark of weakness. A repertoire of songs, and a proud upright bearing in the dance, are necessary for a man's social prestige. Similarly his clothes and appearance on these occasions are important. A man like Costas Pistiolis with his unkempt appearance, clothes fouled with dirt, and his inability to sing or dance, is a figure of mockery at the very few weddings he attends. Graceless (ἀχάριστος), and unnatural (ἀφύσικος), is the verdict passed on this wretched man.

Finally, the degree of dependence on, or independence of, others is a factor which differentiates the prestige of heads of family. To be a tselingas, or a member of the dominant sibling group of a co-operative association of families, carries the greatest prestige. The dependence of a man without brothers on more distant kinsmen is by no means dishonourable, but it is clearly a situation of less prestige. But the family head who is forced to watch the sheep of another unrelated Sarakatsanos, or a villager, for a wage (πόγα) forfeits any pretension to social reputation. It suggests that he is so poor that he cannot live from his flock without the money supplement of the wage, or that he has no relatives with substantial flocks with whom he might co-operate, or that he is not acceptable to them. Customarily a shepherd's wage is paid only partly in money, the balance being given in kind, grain, and a pair of shoes for every six months of service. The galling feature of becoming a wage shepherd is the fact of dependence on an unrelated man and the sense of being a kept man.

/178 cont./

474
233
464
465
In addition to this general framework of mutual obligations, there are others that vary according to the situation. Thus, for example, the participant who does not have livestock works as a paid shepherd. If he has some "heads" he still draws pay and takes care of his livestock together with that of the Tséligato. If he has a considerable flock so that he cannot work for the Tséligato, he does not receive wages but merely enjoys the general benefits and pays an equal share of the expenses.

Sometimes the participant has a very large number of sheep (200 for example) and of personnel (shepherds) for their tending. In this case it may happen his shepherds will care for his own livestock, while he himself takes care of the flocks of the Tséligato that do not have a shepherd; he will then receive wages for his work.

On the other hand, if his personnel is not sufficient, it is the Tséligato that will procure a shepherd for him on condition that he pay the Tséligato the wages of the latter.

474
233
464
Furthermore, the women of the participant's family must also work for all the flocks, regardless of the number of livestock belonging to their own family.

474
233
465
The expenses of herding are apportioned on the basis of "head of milch ewes," without allowing for the yield of each. Other expenses, that is to say, the duties and taxes imposed on the products, the expenses of hospitality of the Tséligato, the travel expenses of the Tséligas on behalf of the cooperative, etc., are divided equally among the participants on the basis of the number of animals each one owns.

474
554
672
The Tséligas is personally responsible to the participants in case of loss of livestock caused by his carelessness. He is held also responsible if he entrusts the sheep of one /179/ of the members to an incompetent shepherd and the latter's incompetence causes their loss.